

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action of November 1, 2006 (the “Final Office Action”), Claims 1-11, 19, 24-35, 37-56, and 66-72 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) in light of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0053979 A1 (“Kori”) and U.S. Pat. No. 4,933,971 issued to Bestock et al. (“Bestock”).

The specification has been amended to specify the application serial number for the provisional application from which this application claims priority, and to delete reference to another patent application that was incorporated by reference. No new matter has been added by such amendment and deletion. Applicants respectfully request that the claim of priority on the provisional application whose serial number is now specified be properly recognized in the file.

Claims 1-11, 24-26, 37-56, and 72-77 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 24-26, and 42 have been amended; Claims 12-23, 27-36 and 57-71 have been cancelled; and Claims 73-77 are new.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a “secure registry encrypted with a registry key generated by using a substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification (see page 4, lines 10-20 in the specification for support of such an identification) of an access authorized host” and a “control module configured to read a memory stored substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of the apparatus, regenerate said registry key by using the memory stored substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification,” and such a secure registry or control module is neither taught nor suggested by Kori or Bestock, alone or in combination.

In Kori, a user management key  $ku$  is used to decrypt an encrypted data encryption key  $kd$ , which in turn, is used to decrypt encrypted A/V data. Thus, Kori's encrypted data encryption key  $kd$  is similar in function to applicants' secure registry, Kori's user management key  $ku$  is similar in function to applicants' registry key, and Kori's data encryption key  $kd$  is similar in function to applicants' "another key" that is stored in the secure registry.

However, Kori's user management key  $ku$  is not regenerated in order to use it to decrypt the secure registry, as required in claim 1. Instead, it is supplied from the A/V data supplying side to the user. See, page 5, paragraph [0081] of Kori. Further, Kori's user management key  $ku$  is not generated by using a substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of an access authorized host.

In Bestock, a dynamic key KDT(n) that was used by a terminal 10 in encrypting a PIN block is regenerated by a host 20 receiving the encrypted PIN block so that it may decrypt the encrypted PIN block. See, Col. 7, lines 31-65. The host 20 regenerates the dynamic key KDT(n) by processing a terminal identification number (TIN) and a transaction number (XSN) received from the terminal 10 along with the encrypted PIN block using SEED keys pre-installed on the host 20. See, Col. 10, lines 5-41 and FIG. 4.

However, none of the TIN, XSN or SEED keys in Bestock is a substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of the host 20. The TIN is the terminal identification number of the terminal 10, not the host 20. It is preferably comprised of a customer number identifying the

particular owner or operator of the host/terminal network, and a particular terminal classification number unique to that terminal in the network. See, Col. 10, lines 10-15. Thus, the TIN does not appear to be even a substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of the terminal 10. The XSN is a transaction number indicative of a number of transactions between the terminal 10 and the host 20. Therefore, the XSN is also not a substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of the host 20. Finally, the SEED keys are also not substantially unique manufacturer assigned identifications of the host 20. In particular, they are not manufacturer assigned identifications of the host 20. They are not even substantially unique to the host 20, since they also reside on the key initialization terminal 15 for performing the same function as they do on the host 20. See, Col. 6, lines 4-10 and FIG. 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kori in light of Bestock for the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-11, 24-26 and 37-41 are also believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kori and Bestock, since they depend from Claim 1, and as such, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons as stated in reference to Claim 1.

Claim 42 has been amended to recite “receiving a secure registry that has been encrypted with a registry key that was generated by using a substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of an access authorized host;” “reading a memory stored substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of the host;” and “regenerating said registry key using the

memory stored substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification;” and such functions are believed to be neither taught nor suggested by Kori or Bestock, alone or in combination, for basically the same reasons as stated in reference to Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 42 is believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kori in light of Bestock for the foregoing reasons.

Claims 43-56 and 72 are also believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kori and Bestock, since they depend from Claim 42, and as such, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons as stated in reference to Claim 42.

Claim 73 is a new claim reciting a “secure registry encrypted with a registry key generated by using a substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of an access authorized hardware device connectable to the apparatus” and a “control module configured to read a memory stored substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of a hardware device connected to the apparatus, regenerate said registry key by using the memory stored substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification,” and such a secure registry or control module is neither taught nor suggested by Kori or Bestock, alone or in combination, for basically the same reasons stated in reference to Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 73 is believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kori in light of Bestock for the foregoing reasons.

New Claims 74-75 are also believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kori and Bestock, since they depend from Claim 73, and as such, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons as stated in reference to Claim 73.

Claim 76 is a new claim reciting “receiving a secure registry that has been encrypted with a registry key that was generated by using a substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of an access authorized hardware device connectable to a host;” “reading a memory stored substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification of a hardware device connected to the host;” and “regenerating said registry key using the memory stored substantially unique manufacturer assigned identification”, and such functions are believed to be neither taught nor suggested by Kori or Bestock, alone or in combination, for basically the same reasons as stated in reference to Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 76 is believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kori in light of Bestock for the foregoing reasons.

New Claim 77 is also believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kori and Bestock, since it depends from Claim 76, and as such, is believed to be patentable for the same reasons as stated in reference to Claim 76.

Claims 1-11, 24-26, 37-56, and 72-77 remain pending in the application. Claims 12-23, 27-36, and 57-71 have been cancelled. New Claims 73-77 have been added. Reconsideration of the

rejections of the pending claims is respectfully requested for the reasons stated herein, and an early notice of their allowance earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
MACROVISION CORPORATION

Dated: 1/3, 2007

George B. Almeida  
George B. Almeida (Reg. No. 20,696)

**Customer No. 31665**  
2830 De La Cruz Boulevard  
Santa Clara, CA 95050  
Tel: (408) 562-8496  
Fax: (408) 567-1800

**FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on January 3, 2007.

Barbara Skliba  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence  
Barbara Skliba  
Signature 1/3/07  
Date